

Adopted April 11, 2008

CMP POLICY & IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Richard J. Sullivan Center / Terrence D. Moore Lecture Hall

15C Springfield Road

New Lisbon, New Jersey

March 28, 2008

MINUTES

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chairperson Betty Wilson, Vice-Chairman Norman Tomasello, Candace Ashmun, Leslie Ficcaglia, Stephen Lee, Ed Lloyd, John Haas (1st Alternate), Robert Hagaman (2nd Alternate) and Paul E. Galletta (3rd Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Robert W. McIntosh

STAFF PRESENT: John Stokes, Susan Grogan, Stacey Roth, Tom Stanuikynas, Paul Leakan and Betsy Piner

Chairperson Wilson called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Stokes read the Open Public Meetings Act statement and called the roll. He announced that Commissioner Haas, as first alternate, would be allowed to vote today. Commissioners Hagaman and Galletta were welcome to participate in discussion but would not vote unless another Commissioner chose to recuse him/herself.

1. Adoption of minutes from the February 29, 2008 CMP Policy and Implementation Committee meeting.

Commissioner Ashmun moved the adoption of the minutes of the February 29, 2008 CMP Policy and Implementation Committee meeting. Commissioner Ficcaglia seconded and all voted in favor.

2. Executive Director's Reports

Egg Harbor City Ordinances 08-07 and 13-07, amending Chapter 170 (Land Use and Development of the City's Code by adopting design standards for major development

Ms. Grogan said that Egg Harbor City had adopted a very detailed set of design standards that cover a wide range of elements found in both residential and commercial areas including open space, architecture, lighting, street furniture, etc. The original iteration, Ordinance 8-07 made no reference to the size or location of the development where these standards are to apply. Following discussion with Commission staff and in recognition that these standards do not work well for individual lots, nor are they consistent with CMP standards in the FA and PAD, the City adopted Ordinance 13-07 to

clarify that these standards exclude existing infill lots and minor subdivisions, as well as all development in the FA and PAD management areas. Combined, the goal of the ordinances is to help redevelopment within the Pinelands Town Area and Ms. Grogan said that the City should be commended for having developed such detailed standards.

In response to a question from Commissioner Lee regarding the City's continued interest in the redevelopment of the area near the intersection of Routes 563 and 30, Ms. Grogan answered in the affirmative and said that just yesterday she had received an amended redevelopment plan from the City for just that area.

Chairperson Wilson asked about the process of communication between the municipalities and the staff in developing their land use documents. Ms. Grogan responded that it varies from town to town; some will want to discuss a proposal in advance of any action by the town; others will submit a draft ordinance for review and still others will submit an adopted document without any advance communication. Staff tries to encourage all the municipalities to alert the staff about their proposals in advance.

Commissioner Ficcaglia complimented the City on trying to improve its design standards and create a more uniform appearance.

Commissioner Ashmun moved the recommendation to the Commission of the certification of Egg Harbor City Ordinances 8-07 and 13-07. Commissioner Tomasello seconded the motion and all were in favor

Folsom Borough's 2007 Master Plan and Ordinances 14-2007 and 15-2007, amending Chapter 200 (Zoning) of the Borough's Code by adopting a revised zoning map, expanding the FC (Forest Commercial) Zone and adding cluster development as a permitted use in the Forest and Rural Development Areas

Ms. Grogan said that Folsom was an example of a municipality that had approached the Commission requesting assistance very early in the master planning process, thus allowing staff to work with them to meet both the needs of the municipality and the CMP. Ms. Grogan directed the Committee to the maps provided with the report.

Ms. Grogan said that, as recommended by its Master Plan, through Ordinance 14-2007 Folsom has expanded its Forest Commercial District along the Black Horse Pike and has created Forest Commercial Receiving and Sending Districts. Under certain conditions, the development of new roadside retail sales and service establishments is permitted within the FA. The new commercial development is permitted within 300' of pre-existing commercial uses in the FA. The new Forest Commercial boundaries expand the zone by approximately 175 acres, most of which is not eligible for development but providing for roughly 100,000 sq-ft of additional commercial development. The newly created sending and receiving zones recognize the common ownership of lands on the Pike within both these zones, eliminate split lot lines between zones and function as a clustering program for commercial development. New commercial development may occur along the Black Horse Pike in the receiving area while the parcels to the rear serve as sending areas for

septic dilution purposes and have limited residential development opportunity. No commercial development is permitted in the Forest Sending Area.

In response to a question from Commissioner Galletta as to why a portion of Forest Sending Area along the Black Horse Pike had been omitted from the Forest Commercial Receiving Area, Ms. Grogan said that those parcels really didn't qualify for commercial development and their exclusion also helped prevent strip development.

In response to Commissioner Lloyd's question regarding any opposition at the municipal level, Ms. Grogan said that, early in the process, some property owners who had been excluded from the commercial zone had wanted to be included but it seemed that those issues were resolved by the time the Commission's public hearing was held as no testimony to that effect was received.

Ms. Grogan said that Ordinance 15-2007, a copy of which had been included in the meeting packet to guide the Committee during its discussion of proposed clustering rules, was based on the model ordinance developed by former employee Alice D'Arcy some years ago. She said that, like Upper Township's recently certified ordinance, Folsom requires a developer to submit a yield plan under conventional development standards and that yield plan will limit the number of units permitted in a cluster development; no bonus is permitted. The lots are to be from 1 to 2 acres in size. The uses on the associated open space will be limited according to an approved Open Space Management Plan and are generally activities related to low intensity recreation or to maintaining/restoring the natural features of the area. The ordinance provides for a range of ownership opportunities.

In response to Commissioner Ashmun's question regarding the open space, Ms. Grogan said that the municipal planning board and the Commission staff would evaluate the deed restrictions along with the development plan and all standards would need to be consistent with the CMP.

Commissioner Lee noted an inconsistency in a cross reference within the ordinance and Mr. Stokes stated that staff would bring that to the attention of the Borough.

Commissioner Ficaglia moved the recommendation to the Commission of the certification of Folsom Borough's 2007 Master Plan and Ordinances 14-2007 and 15-2007. Commissioner Lloyd seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Medford Township Resolution 45-2006, adopting a November 2006 Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan, and Ordinances 2007-33 and 2008-4, amending the Township's Land Development Ordinance by requiring PDC use for major residential development in the GMS, GD, RGD-1 and VRD Districts and adding age-restricted affordable housing as a permitted use in the PPE (Park/Public/Education) District

Ms. Grogan said that like Folsom, Medford Township was a municipality with specific goals that had approached staff early in the planning process. Medford had adopted a new Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan in response COAH's (Council on Affordable Housing) 3rd Round Rules recommending, among other things, the development of age-restricted affordable housing on a municipal property within the PPE (Park/Public/Education) District and recommending that the permitted uses in that district be changed to add affordable age-restricted housing as a permitted use.

Staff worked with Medford to develop the implementing ordinances to increase the permitted density and eliminate the PDC obligation on the 3.5 acre parcel where the age restricted housing is to be developed. The PDC obligation was transferred elsewhere in the Township by increasing the permitted residential density in other zones and requiring the mandatory use of PDCs for major development in four RGA residential zones.

Ms. Grogan said that she was pleased with the ordinances as they provide a better zoning scheme and promote the use of PDCs in Medford where virtually no PDCs have been used. She noted the presence in the audience of Douglas McCollister, representing Medford Township, and Mr. Matthew Reilly, President of MEND (Moorestown Ecumenical Neighborhood Development, Inc.). She said that both had attended the Commission's public hearing; there were no other attendees or public comment submitted.

Mr. Douglas McCollister said that Parker McCay serves as the general counsel to Medford Township and his role is that of the COAH counsel for the Township. He provided a history of Medford Township's COAH certification, noting that with changing rules, it has been challenging to meet their obligation. He said that the Township had been ready to submit its Third Round affordable housing obligation plan to Judge Sweeney for certification when a court order invalidated certain provisions of the Third Round rules. While the new Third Round rules are being developed, the Township hopes to proceed with this project in order to remain in good standing and to provide the much needed affordable housing for the community.

Mr. McCollister said that, in order to leverage its affordable housing trust fund to the greatest extent possible, for this particular project, the Township is partnering with MEND, a non-profit organization promoting affordable housing in Burlington County. This 36 unit project is close to shopping and professional services in the vicinity of the Public Safety Building

Mr. McCollister thanked the staff for helping the Township through the process.

In response to Commissioner Lee's question if the affordable housing site was the old Singer House near the Public Safety building, preserved behind a fence but falling down, Mr. McCollister confirmed that it was.

Commissioner Haas moved the recommendation to the Commission of the certification of Medford Township Resolution 45-2006, adopting a November 2006 Housing Plan

Element and Fair Share Plan, and Ordinances 2007-33 and 2008-4. Commissioner Lloyd seconded the motion and all were in favor.

Stormwater Plans and Ordinances

Ms. Grogan said that roughly half the towns had completed the certification process for their stormwater management plans and stormwater control ordinances. She said that the little variation that does occur from one municipality to the next is related more to the Plans than the ordinances. The issues tend to focus on mitigation and, in some cases, build-out, the latter being a DEP requirement and not needed for conformance with the CMP. She said that staff was recommending full certification of the stormwater documents submitted by Berlin, Estell Manor and Vineland.

Ms. Grogan asked to defer until the April meeting any recommendation on Mullica's Stormwater Plan and ordinance. She noted that at the public hearing on March 26, 2008, public comment had been submitted regarding the proposed mitigation projects. She said that she would like to discuss the issues with the Township before proceeding.

Berlin Township's October 2007 Stormwater Management Plan and Ordinance 2008:3.

Commissioner Ficcaglia moved the recommendation to the Commission of the certification of Berlin Township's October 2007 Stormwater Management Plan and Ordinance 2008:3. Commissioner Tomasello seconded the motion and all were in favor

City of Estell Manor's October 2007 Stormwater Management Plan and Ordinance 01-2007

Commissioner Ashmun moved the recommendation to the Commission of the certification of Estell Manor City's October 2007 Stormwater Management Plan and Ordinance 01-2007. Commissioner Lloyd seconded the motion and all were in favor.

City of Vineland's Planning Board Resolutions 5436 and 5752 and Ordinance 2007-40

Commissioner Lloyd moved the recommendation to the Commission of the certification of the City of Vineland's Planning Board Resolutions 5436 and 5752 and Ordinance 2007-40. Commissioner Tomasello seconded the motion and all were in favor.

3. Continued discussion of proposed CMP amendment related to cluster development in the Forest and Rural Development Areas

(Mr. Stokes said that prior to this discussion, Mr. Fred Akers, Administrator of the Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association, had sent him a letter regarding Mandatory Clustering. Chairperson Wilson announced that the Committee would be unable to

discuss this letter at this time without the opportunity to read it. The letter is included in these minutes as Attachment A.)

Mr. Stokes, referencing his March 18, 2008 Clustering Memorandum from the meeting packet, led a discussion of those items that had been discussed at the Committee's February 29 meeting and for which further clarification of information had been requested. (*numbers refer to the Principles listed in the March 20, 2008 attachment to that Memo*). He said that he didn't think that any of the items listed will have a significant effect on the underlying framework for clustering.

Commissioner Lloyd said that because he had not attended the February 29, 2008 meeting, he appreciated the format.

Mr. Stokes said that #1 is a response to concerns expressed by Commissioner Lee regarding the Pinelands Protection Act (PPA).

Commissioner Lee said that he was grappling with the concept of preserving habitat for "characteristic and rare Pinelands flora and fauna" as he felt that the CMP had already done enough of that.

Mr. Stokes said that the PPA lays out the goals for the Protection Area. Some 28 years ago, the Commission tried to reflect those different goals in the land use designations provided for the Protection Area.

Mr. Stokes said that characteristic Pinelands attributes are expressed in terms of forest canopy, water quality and plant and animal communities. Clustering in the Forest Area will help maintain those essential characteristic communities and reduce "piecemeal and scattered" development.

Commissioner Lee said that he was concerned with the overemphasis on one type of land cover over another, to the exclusion of others. He asked what it was the Commission was trying to do and said that a monoculture might be a good thing or maybe introducing diversity is a good goal. He said that he objected to the prohibition of agriculture and forestry from the Forest Area where they are currently allowed.

Mr. Stokes said that his March 18, 2008 memo was an attempt to be true to the language of the PPA.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ashmun if the Commission were able to incorporate a reference to the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) into the clustering rule proposal (*New Principle*), Mr. Stokes said that there are a variety of sections of the MLUL that might be touched by a clustering rule but he said he felt it inadvisable to reference specific sections of the MLUL.

He asked the Committee to recall the presentation by former employee Ms. Alice D'Arcy some years ago. Last Fall the Committee decided to look at it again. He said that if the

Committee could develop consensus today on the principles, then he felt that staff could develop rules. He said that these principles will guide staff in preparing rules and can be included in the background materials but were needed for guidance at this time. Referencing Principle #4, Mr. Stokes said that it recognized Commissioner Ashmun's interest in encouraging the municipalities to do some planning and that the Commission wanted to avoid "one size fits all" planning. For instance, previously Commissioner Galletta had expressed concern about recreation facilities in his community. The municipalities should have the ability to tailor the clustering program to meet their needs.

Commissioner Ashmun said that good planning must meet certain principles and that there must be a limit to municipal flexibility.

Commissioner Lloyd said that he agreed with the policy but that he worried that "sound land use planning practice" could open up all sorts of deviations. It was difficult to set the criteria.

Mr. Stokes said that the criteria would be reflected in the rule language. He said that there are two parts to this:

1. Should the Commission recognize that the municipalities should be given the ability to tailor some of these principles? (If the rule is adopted, clustering will be mandatory.) The Commission needs to decide whether some latitude can be established.
2. When the Commission authorized the RGA density reduction provisions, sound planning was required in those municipalities that chose to reduce their densities. However, although the Commission established the rules, in most cases, the "good planning" was a paper exercise. Mr. Stokes said that he had sufficient confidence in the Planning Office to know if the municipal flexibility provision were applied appropriately.

Commissioner Ashmun said that the rules should define what would be allowed under a clustering provision that was "different" from the CMP.

Commissioner Haas said that he agreed that having municipal flexibility is a good policy.

Ms. Grogan said that there is existing language in the CMP; alternative programs developed under municipal flexibility still must meet the goals and objectives of the CMP. That same language could be used in the regulations providing for cluster development.

Commissioner Lloyd said that criteria were needed for the Commission and for the municipalities so that all would know how the rules would apply.

Referencing Principle #7, Mr. Stokes said that, early in the staff clustering analysis, it was observed that land tenure patterns are such that a lot of property is owned by individual property owners in relatively small lots. Clustering is not efficient on small

lots and the Commission made a determination that the density bonus should be tied to the size of the property. Larger properties that existed prior to the clustering rules are not necessarily excluded but there needs to be an incentive to encourage the assemblage of parcels.

Commissioner Ashmun said that she was concerned as to *when* the bonus density would apply.

Mr. Stokes responded that *when* an application is submitted, the project review office will determine what comprises the tract of land; it could be composed of lands assembled both before or after the effective date of the rules. The municipalities could be given an opportunity to determine when the bonus will apply, either before or after their implementing ordinances are developed.

A discussion ensued as to whether a bonus was to be granted for assembling properties, assembling large properties, assembling properties at a particular location and if a bonus should relate to when that assemblage took place.

Mr. Stokes reminded the Committee that they had agreed previously to grant a bonus for larger lots. Furthermore, as the vast majority of projects in the FA and RDA are on smaller lots and parcels not suitable for clustering, an incentive to assemble small lots would be offered as a bonus in the rules. If the municipalities wish to make the determination as to *when* that assemblage takes place, that could be at their discretion (#7)

Commissioner Ashmun said that providing a bonus for large lots does not say, to her, a bonus for *assemblage* of lots.

Mr. Stokes provided an example: a property owner has five contiguous parcels totaling 200 acres. Next door are many smaller parcels with multiple owners. The municipality adopts a clustering ordinance. After that, a new property owner purchases all those smaller parcels and “assembles” them. Now the question becomes, should the person with the 200 acres receive a bonus density, or only the “new” person who assembled all those little lots after the municipality adopted a clustering ordinance. Mr. Stokes said that to make that determination on a regional basis would be very difficult for Commission staff to administer (tracking details related to ownership, e.g. partnerships, limited partnerships, etc. would be onerous). It would be more appropriate to allow the municipality to make that bonus determination as they would be better equipped to track the land ownership pattern, should any municipality be interested in doing so. The clustering rules will not make a distinction as to when the property was acquired.

Commissioner Lee suggested that perhaps above a certain tract size the bonus might be limited or, maybe the rules should indicate that the municipality has the option to decide that they do not want to grant a bonus for assemblage.

Commissioner Lloyd said that he thought the only question was whether or not to grant a bonus to tracts that exist today.

Mr. Stokes said that with the difficulty in tracking land ownership data, why would the Commission have any objection to a municipality that was willing to go through the process.

In response to Chairperson Wilson's question as to why one would want to give the municipality that flexibility, Mr. Stokes responded that the Committee had expressed concerns and his role was to address those concerns. He said that he did not think that awarding a bonus for assemblage after the rules were in place would undermine a clustering program. He said that Weymouth Township had a concern. One property owner with ~1800 acres would qualify for a relatively modest bonus. With 20-acre zoning, that parcel would yield 90 lots. If a 30% bonus were to be granted, it would lead to the permanent protection of a significant amount of land but, if the municipality is concerned about that many extra homes, it would be their call as to whether or not the bonus is granted for lands assembled prior to the clustering rules.

Referencing Principle #12, Commissioner Lee suggested that limiting the size of the area for recreation facilities within the cluster might preclude adequate clearing to allow sufficient recreation.

Mr. Stokes said that, using national recreation standards, there are recommendations based on the number of residents. There is nothing "magic" about a ½ acre of recreation space but earlier discussions by the Committee had expressed concern with the amount of open space *within* the cluster; this was an attempt to indicate that the Committee might want to impose some sort of limit to the area dedicated to recreation.

Commissioner Lloyd said that he wanted to see trails, but he did not want to encourage ATVs.

Mr. Stokes reminded the Committee that this was referencing the open space *within* the residential area, not the open space that is deed restricted outside the development area.

Mr. Stokes said that Principle #13 had been suggested by Commissioner Kennedy. The Committee responded that the deed restrictions on the protected lands must be sufficiently clear and that the more eyes to monitor/enforce open space deed restrictions, the better.

Mr. Stokes said that the Committee needed to look at the open space ownership. Whatever protection/enforcement mechanisms are established, they should be administered equally whether by county, municipality or homeowners association. He said that he believed that the homeowners within the cluster should have the right to own the open space.

Chairperson Wilson said that if the open space is owned by a municipality, it is easy for a landowner to “complain” if it is not being cared for appropriately. If it is owned by one of the residents, it is a more difficult situation and the objectors might have to go to court.

Mr. Stokes said that no arrangement is perfect, e.g. stormwater basins owned by homeowners’ associations are a problem.

Ms. Roth said that there is the issue of ownership vs. enforcement rights. There are 3rd party beneficiary enforcement rights whether or not there is a single landowner or other arrangement.

Commissioner Haas said that in Ocean County, the County will be willing to accept ownership of the open space if it were adjacent/in close proximity to a county park or NGO open space.

Mr. Stokes said that ownership of property usually depends upon where it is located.

Commissioner Lee said that he was in favor of adding the State or county as an owner of the protected land and also favored adding large private landowners. He indicated that owners of adjacent lands, particularly farms, should also be able to own and manage the protected open space lands.

Commissioner Ficcaglia expressed concern with permitting private ownership of the reserved parcel.

Commissioner Ashmun said that there needs to be sufficient safeguards on the restricted open space and there needs to be 3rd party enforcement ability.

Mr. Stokes said that the ownership of the underlying fee does not exclude other stewardship arrangements. He said that the Committee is trying to develop a regional program, the best possible one it can, and trying to limit what can be done on that property. Under the MLUL, clustering calls for the open space to be in common ownership to the benefit of the residents of the cluster. Open lands ownership is permitted but it is not technically “clustering.” He said that he believed it is better to provide a range of opportunities to the municipalities, complete with safeguards that there is clear stewardship and enforcement ability.

Commissioner Lee said that he thought that good stewardship was promoted through ownership, e.g., a 98-year lease owned by a municipality but granted to a landowner who was on site would be the best way to protect the land. DEP might have good intentions but it does not have the resources to manage land.

Commissioner Wilson said to Ms. Roth that she had the assignment to develop the appropriate deed restrictions.

Commissioner Ashmun said that although the deed language cannot be included in the rule, the principles can be outlined in the rule.

Mr. Stokes said that if the Committee wanted to include specific easement language as part of the rule, it would require at least a year. It would be better to provide a model for reference.

Ms. Grogan said that upon adoption of the rules, the municipalities will be provided with sample ordinances including easement language.

Mr. Stokes said that *Principle #14* referenced Commissioner Kennedy's interest in having the easement on the open space in favor a public agency such as the county agriculture development committee or the SADC.

Commissioner Lloyd said that he did not object to adding SADC but did not believe in excluding the landowner.

Commissioner Lee said that he believed that Commissioner Kennedy was recognizing that the County boards and the SADC already have the authority and a mechanism in place to reconcile issues with the "right to farm." Commissioner Galletta concurred.

Mr. Stokes said that the issue of ownership and stewardship are the most difficult issues to resolve. He saw open lands ownership as a means of bridging the gap to those who believe the lands should not be held in private hands once developed. He said that there are many options relating ownership of the land and the easement, e.g. homeowners association owns the land and leases it to a farmer or grants an agricultural easement in favor of the farmer or ownership of the land by the municipality or a non-profit and a variety of combinations. He said that the primary interest of all involved can be protected by the open lands ownership. But, in any case, the Committee should remember that <2% of the FA is actively farmed.

Referencing #15, Mr. Stokes said that Commissioner Kennedy had advised him that the 3% impervious cover is the threshold trigger for the requirement of a Resource Management System Plan (RSMP). He said that such a plan is more comprehensive than a farmland management plan and addresses not only soil and water but other elements. Commissioner Kennedy was not suggesting a limit on the 3% impervious cover but that an expansion beyond 3% would require an approved plan submitted to the Commission.

Commissioner Ashmun warned that there was nothing compulsory in these plans.

Mr. Stokes said that, if the Commission were to approve a plan, the applicant would be legally obligated to abide by it.

In response to Commissioner Lloyd's concern about expanding beyond the 3% limit, Mr. Stokes said that, yes, it was the intent to allow an expansion beyond the 3% under an approved plan, a plan for which CMP requirements regarding water quality, stormwater, etc. would still have to be met.

Commissioner Lloyd said that he did not want to delegate the Commission's authority to an RSMP.

Mr. Stokes reminded the Committee that there were very few projects to which this might apply and also that he had an obligation to respond to all Commission members with their various opinions.

Commissioner Wilson said that there still appeared to be issues related to Principles #7 and #15 and they would be taken up at a future meeting. In addition, the Committee would need to discuss whether the same clustering program should apply in both the Forest and Rural Development Areas.

Commissioner Haas said that staff had prepared a good list for discussion.

4. Public Comment

Mr. Frank Banisch, a municipal planner who represents a landowner in Weymouth Township, commended the Committee on its work to reduce the size of the development footprint in the Forest Area. He said that he felt that development of one house on one acre was still too big an area and that more compact, multifamily development would be best. The more one can shrink the footprint, the more land one can preserve. Although the alternate design wastewater treatment systems are not yet sufficiently sophisticated, within the next few years the technology that is being advanced will be able to protect water quality on smaller lots.

Mr. Fred Akers said that he did not see how clustering development on one portion of a lot will "protect" it. He said that any development on less than 1 du/3.2 acres would not seem to be as effective at protecting water quality. Regarding issue #12 (that within a cluster development, all lands and facilities needed to support that cluster be available), Mr. Akers said that such a requirement will serve to protect the open space of the cluster. Finally, Mr. Akers also told a story about visiting a Lowe's home improvement store and learning that they have a basin maintenance crew charged with assuring proper function of the basins at all their facilities.

Mr. Harry Monesson, Pemberton Township resident, said that 92% of the land within his municipality is government owned and that more ratables were needed.

5. Other Items of Interest

The meeting adjourned at 12:58 p.m. (moved by Commissioner Haas and seconded by Commissioner Tomasello.)

/CS15A

CMP POLICY & IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Richard J. Sullivan Center / Terrence D. Moore Lecture Hall
15C Springfield Road
New Lisbon, New Jersey
March 28, 2008

SUMMARY

The Committee **adopted the minutes** of the February 29, 2008 meeting.

The Committee **recommended Commission certification** of the following documents:

Egg Harbor City Ordinances 08-07 and 13-07 (adopting design standards for major development)

Folsom Borough's 2007 Master Plan and Ordinances 14-2007 and 15-2007, adopting a revised zoning map, expanding the FC (Forest Commercial) Zone and adding cluster development as a permitted use in the Forest and Rural Development Areas

Medford Township Resolution 45-2006, adopting a November 2006 Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan, and **Ordinances 2007-33 and 2008-4** requiring PDC use for major residential development in certain zones and adding age-restricted affordable housing as a permitted use in the PPE (Park/Public/Education) District

Stormwater Management Plans and Stormwater Control Ordinances submitted by the following municipalities in response to the May 2006 CMP amendments:

Cities of **Estell Manor and Vineland**
Berlin Township

The Committee continued its discussion of clustering in the Forest and Rural Development Areas and determined that further discussion was needed regarding: bonuses for the larger tracts; issues related to agricultural uses/easements; and whether the same clustering program should apply in both the Forest and Rural Development Areas.

/CS15A